Conserved charges of the extended Bondi-Metzner-Sachs algebra

Éanna É. Flanagan[1,*] and David A. Nichols[2,†]

[1] *Department of Physics, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, USA*
[2] *Cornell Center for Astrophysics and Planetary Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, USA*

Isolated objects in asymptotically flat spacetimes in general relativity are characterized by their conserved charges associated with the Bondi-Metzner-Sachs (BMS) group. These charges include total energy, linear momentum, intrinsic angular momentum and center-of-mass location, and in addition an infinite number of supermomentum charges associated with supertranslations. Recently it has been suggested that the BMS symmetry algebra should be enlarged to include an infinite number of additional symmetries known as superrotations. We compute the corresponding "super center-of-mass" charges and show that they are finite and well defined. The supermomentum charges are associated with ordinary gravitational wave memory, and the super center-of-mass charges are associated with total (ordinary plus null) gravitational wave memory, in the terminology of Bieri and Garfinkle. Some of these charges can give rise to black hole hair, as described by Strominger and Zhiboedov. We clarify how this hair evades the no hair theorems.

arXiv:1510.03386v2 [hep-th] 28 Oct 2015

CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. The BMS symmetry group and the extended BMS algebra 2
A. Asymptotically flat spacetimes in retarded Bondi coordinates 2
B. BMS symmetry group 3
C. Canonical Bondi frame for stationary regions 4
D. Extended BMS algebra 4

III. BMS conserved charges 5
A. Charges for standard BMS algebra 5
B. Charges for extended BMS algebra 6

IV. Physical interpretation of BMS and extended BMS charges 7
A. General considerations 7
B. Relation to gravitational wave memory 8
C. BMS charges as black hole hair 9

V. Conclusions 9

Acknowledgments 9

A. Transformation properties of charges under finite BMS transformations 10

References 10

I. INTRODUCTION

Spacetimes which are asymptotically flat at future null infinity in general relativity have a group of asymptotic symmetries known as the BMS group [1–3]. Associated with each generator $\vec{\xi}$ of this group and each cross-section of future null infinity, there is a conserved charge[1] Q [4–6]. These charges include all the charges associated with the Poincaré group and in addition an infinite number of new supermomentum charges associated with supertranslations. The generators $\vec{\xi}$ of the BMS group are smooth vector fields on future null infinity $\mathcal{I}^+$.

Recently Banks [7] and Barnich and Troessaert [8–10] have suggested that a larger symmetry algebra might be physically relevant. In particular they suggested including vector fields called "superrotations" which contain analytic singularities as functions on the conformal 2-sphere at infinity. These are formally infinitesimal symmetries of the theory but cannot be exponentiated to yield smooth finite diffeomorphisms, unlike the generators of the standard BMS group. There is not yet a general theory for understanding when singular vector fields of this type can be used to construct conserved charges and fluxes at future null infinity, and there has been some debate in the literature on the physical relevance or utility of the extended algebra.

One approach to this question is to determine whether the new symmetries give rise to relations between S-matrix elements, like the standard symmetries do [11, 12]. This was shown to be the case for the tree level S-matrix by Kapec, Lysov, Pasterski and Strominger [13].

Another approach is to determine whether the new symmetries give rise to well-defined and finite classical conserved quantities. Here we adopt this approach, following Barnich and Troessaert [10] who showed that the charges associated with superrotations vanish in the Kerr spacetime. We show that the superrotation charges are in general finite, and we call them "super center-of-mass" charges since they are generalizations of the center-of-

* eef3@cornell.edu
† dnichols@astro.cornell.edu

[1] By conserved charge we mean a charge that would be conserved in the absence of fluxes of radiation to null infinity.

mass piece of special relativistic angular momentum. In addition we show that supermomentum charges are associated with ordinary gravitational wave memory, and super center-of-mass charges are associated with total (ordinary plus null) gravitational wave memory, in the terminology of Bieri and Garfinkle [14].

The paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews the standard BMS group and algebra and also the extended BMS algebra. In Sec. III we compute the conserved charges, and in Sec. IV we make some remarks about the physical significance of BMS and extended BMS charges and how they can be measured.

II. THE BMS SYMMETRY GROUP AND THE EXTENDED BMS ALGEBRA

A. Asymptotically flat spacetimes in retarded Bondi coordinates

We start by reviewing the definition of the BMS symmetry group and its action on solutions of Einsteins equations near future null infinity. We closely follow the exposition of Barnich and Troessaert [8, 15] as simplified and specialized by Strominger and collaborators [11–13, 16, 17]. Our notation will however follow Barnich and Troessaert in maintaining covariance with respect to the 2-sphere coordinates, instead of using the complex coordinate convention used in Refs. [11–13, 16, 17].

Following Refs. [1, 8, 11–13, 15–17] we use retarded Bondi coordinates $(u, r, \theta^1, \theta^2)$ near future null infinity. The metric has the form

$$ds^2 = -Ue^{2\beta}du^2 - 2e^{2\beta}dudr + r^2\gamma_{AB}(d\theta^A - \mathcal{U}^A du)(d\theta^B - \mathcal{U}^B du), \quad (2.1)$$

where $A, B = 1, 2$, and U, β, $\mathcal{U}^A$ and γ_{AB} are functions of u, r, θ^A. The four gauge conditions that are imposed are $g_{rr} = 0$, $g_{rA} = 0$ and in addition

$$\partial_r \det(\gamma_{AB}) = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

We now expand the metric functions as series in $1/r$. The order in $1/r$ at which the various expansions start can be deduced from the covariant definition of asymptotic flatness at future null infinity [18]. The expansions are[2] [1, 8, 11–13, 15–17]:

$$\beta = \frac{\beta_0}{r} + \frac{\beta_1}{r^2} + \frac{\beta_2}{r^3} + O(r^{-4}), \quad (2.3a)$$

$$U = 1 - \frac{2m}{r} - \frac{2\mathcal{M}}{r^2} + O(r^{-3}), \quad (2.3b)$$

$$\gamma_{AB} = h_{AB} + \frac{1}{r}C_{AB} + \frac{1}{r^2}D_{AB} + \frac{1}{r^3}E_{AB} + O(r^{-4}), \quad (2.3c)$$

$$\mathcal{U}^A = \frac{1}{r^2}U^A + \frac{1}{r^3}\Big[-\frac{2}{3}N^A + \frac{1}{16}D^A(C_{BC}C^{BC}) + \frac{1}{2}C^{AB}D^C C_{BC}\Big] + O(r^{-4}). \quad (2.3d)$$

Here the various coefficients on the right hand sides are functions of (u, θ^A) only. The metric $h_{AB}(\theta^C)$ is the fixed round metric on the unit 2-sphere. In adapted coordinates (θ, φ) it is $d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2$, but we will use general coordinates θ^A and retain two dimensional covariance throughout. We adopt the convention that capital Roman indices A, B etc are raised and lowered with h_{AB}, and we denote by D_A the covariant derivative associated with h_{AB}. There are three important, leading order functions in the metric expansion coefficients [1, 8, 11–13, 15–17]: the Bondi mass aspect $m(u, \theta^A)$, the angular momentum aspect[3] $N^A(u, \theta^A)$, and the symmetric tensor $C_{AB}(u, \theta^A)$ whose derivative

$$N_{AB} = \partial_u C_{AB} \quad (2.4)$$

is the Bondi news tensor.

Imposing the gauge condition (2.2) now yields the constraints

$$h^{AB}C_{AB} = 0, \quad (2.5a)$$

$$D_{AB} = C_{CD}C^{CD}h_{AB}/4 + \mathcal{D}_{AB}, \quad (2.5b)$$

$$E_{AB} = C_{CD}\mathcal{D}^{CD}h_{AB}/2 + \mathcal{E}_{AB}, \quad (2.5c)$$

where the tensors $\mathcal{D}_{AB}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{AB}$ are traceless.

We assume the following behavior[4] of the stress energy tensor as $r \to \infty$:

$$T_{uu} = \frac{1}{r^2}\hat{T}_{uu}(u, \theta^A) + O(r^{-3}), \quad (2.6a)$$

$$T_{rr} = \frac{1}{r^4}\hat{T}_{rr}(u, \theta^A) + \frac{1}{r^5}\tilde{T}_{rr}(u, \theta^A) + O(r^{-6}), \quad (2.6b)$$

$$T_{uA} = \frac{1}{r^2}\hat{T}_{uA}(u, \theta^A) + O(r^{-3}), \quad (2.6c)$$

[2] Some of the higher order terms in these expansions are not needed in this section but will be needed in Sec. II C below.

[3] Our definition of angular momentum aspect N_A, cf. Eq. (2.3d) above, follows Ref. [17] rather than the one used in Ref. [15]. Our definition also coincides with that used in Sec. 5.6 of the book by Chrusciel, Jezierski and Kijowski [19], up to a factor of -3.

[4] Stress energy conservation implies that only the stress energy components that appear in Eqs. (2.6) are independent, the others can be deduced from these.

together with $T_{ur} = O(r^{-4})$, $T_{rA} = O(r^{-3})$, $h^{AB}T_{AB} = O(r^{-1})$, $T_{AB} - h_{AB}h^{CD}T_{CD}/2 = O(r^{-2})$. These assumptions are motivated by the behavior of radiative scalar field solutions in Minkowski spacetime.

We now impose Einstein's equations $G_{ab} = 8\pi T_{ab}$, in units with $G = 1$. We adopt the shorthand notation that $O(\alpha\beta, n)$ means the $O(r^{-n})$ piece of the $(\alpha\beta)$ component of the Einstein equation. We obtain

$$U_A = -D^B C_{AB}/2, \tag{2.7a}$$
$$\beta_0 = 0, \tag{2.7b}$$
$$\beta_1 = -\frac{1}{32}C_{AB}C^{AB} - \pi\hat{T}_{rr}, \tag{2.7c}$$
$$\beta_2 = -\frac{1}{12}C_{AB}D^{AB} - \frac{2\pi}{3}\tilde{T}_{rr}, \tag{2.7d}$$
$$D_A\mathcal{D}^{AB} = -4\pi D_B\hat{T}_{rr}, \tag{2.7e}$$
$$\partial_u\mathcal{D}_{AB} = 0, \tag{2.7f}$$

from $O(rA, 2)$, $O(rr, 3)$, $O(rr, 4)$, $O(rr, 5)$, $O(rA, 3)$ and $O(AB, 1)$ respectively. We also obtain from $O(uu, 2)$ and $O(uA, 2)$ evolution equations for the Bondi mass aspect m and the angular momentum aspect N_A [11, 15, 17]:

$$\dot{m} = -4\pi\hat{T}_{uu} - \frac{1}{8}N_{AB}N^{AB} + \frac{1}{4}D_AD_BN^{AB}, \tag{2.8a}$$
$$\begin{aligned}\dot{N}_A = &-8\pi\hat{T}_{uA} + D_Am + \frac{1}{4}D_BD_AD_CC^{BC}\\ &-\frac{1}{4}D_BD^BD^CC_{CA} + \frac{1}{4}D_B(N^{BC}C_{CA})\\ &+\frac{1}{2}D_BN^{BC}C_{CA}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.8b}$$

Here dots denote derivatives with respect to u.

B. BMS symmetry group

BMS symmetries are diffeomorphisms of future null infinity, $\mathcal{I}^+$, to itself that preserve its intrinsic geometric properties [18, 20]. Explicitly in Bondi coordinates the diffeomorphism ψ takes the point (u, θ^A) on $\mathcal{I}^+$ to $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta}^A)$, where

$$\bar{u} = \frac{1}{w(\theta^A)}\left[u + \alpha(\theta^A)\right], \quad \bar{\theta}^A = \bar{\theta}^A(\theta^B). \tag{2.9}$$

Here the mapping $\theta^A \to \bar{\theta}^A(\theta^B)$ must be a conformal isometry of the two sphere, of which there is a six parameter group, and the corresponding function ω is defined by $\psi_* h_{AB} = \omega^{-2}h_{AB}$. The function α can be freely chosen. The corresponding infinitesimal symmetries are $\bar{u} = u + \xi^u$, $\bar{\theta}^A = \theta^A + \xi^A$, where the vector field $\vec{\xi}$ on $\mathcal{I}^+$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{\xi} &= \xi^u\partial_u + \xi^A\partial_A\\ &= \left[\alpha(\theta^A) + \frac{1}{2}uD_AY^A(\theta^B)\right]\partial_u + Y^A(\theta_B)\partial_A\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Here $Y^A(\theta^B)$ must be a conformal Killing vector on the 2-sphere, i.e. be a solution of

$$2D_{(A}Y_{B)} - D_CY^Ch_{AB} = 0. \tag{2.11}$$

Three of these $SL(2, C)$ vector fields are of the form $Y^A = D^A\chi$, where χ is an $l = 1$ spherical harmonic, i.e. satisfies $(D^2 + 2)\chi = 0$ where $D^2 = D_AD^A$, and the other three are of the form $Y^A = \epsilon^{AB}D_B\chi$.

The symmetry vector fields $\vec{\xi}$ can be extended from future null infinity $\mathcal{I}^+$ into the interior of the spacetime to give approximate asymptotic Killing vectors, by demanding that they maintain the retarded Bondi coordinate conditions and the assumed scalings with r of the metric components. This gives [11, 15]

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{\xi} = &f\partial_u + \left[Y^A - \frac{1}{r}D^Af + \frac{1}{2r^2}C^{AB}D_Bf + O(r^{-3})\right]\partial_A\\ &-\left[\frac{1}{2}rD_AY^A - \frac{1}{2}D^2f - \frac{1}{2r}U^AD_Af\right.\\ &\left.+\frac{1}{4r}D_A(D_BfC^{AB}) + O(r^{-2})\right]\partial_r,\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

where

$$f(u, \theta^A) = \alpha(\theta^A) + \frac{1}{2}uD_BY^B(\theta^A). \tag{2.13}$$

Under these transformations the metric transforms via pullback as $g_{ab} \to \psi_* g_{ab} = g_{ab} + \mathcal{L}_{\vec{\xi}}g_{ab}$ which yields the following transformations of the metric functions [11, 15]:

$$\delta m = f\dot{m} + \frac{1}{4}N^{AB}D_AD_Bf + \frac{1}{2}D_AfD_BN^{AB} + \frac{3}{2}m\psi + Y^AD_Am + \frac{1}{8}C^{AB}D_AD_B\psi, \tag{2.14a}$$
$$\delta C_{AB} = fN_{AB} - 2D_AD_Bf + h_{AB}D^2f - \frac{1}{2}\psi C_{AB} + \mathcal{L}_{\vec{Y}}C_{AB}, \tag{2.14b}$$
$$\begin{aligned}\delta N_A = &f\dot{N}_A + 3mD_Af + \frac{1}{4}C_{AB}D^BD^2f - \frac{3}{4}D_Bf(D^BD_CC^C{}_A - D_AD_CC^{BC}) + \frac{3}{8}D_A(C^{BC}D_BD_Cf)\\ &+\frac{1}{4}(2D_AD_Bf - h_{AB}D^2f)D_CC^{BC} + \mathcal{L}_{\vec{Y}}N_A + \psi N_A - \frac{1}{2}D_B(\psi D^{BA}) - \frac{1}{32}D_A\psi C_{BC}C^{BC} + \ldots.\end{aligned} \tag{2.14c}$$

Here on the right hand sides N_{AB} is the Bondi news tensor (2.4), overdots denote derivatives with respect to u, $\mathcal{L}$ is a Lie derivative, f is defined by Eq. (2.13),

$$\psi \equiv D_A Y^A, \tag{2.15}$$

and the ellipsis ... in Eq. (2.14c) indicates terms involving the news tensor N_{AB} which we will not need in what follows.

C. Canonical Bondi frame for stationary regions

Consider a neighborhood of a region of $\mathcal{I}^+$ in which the spacetime is stationary, and in which the leading order stress-energy components (2.6) as well as subleading components vanish. Then it is known that there exist Bondi frames in which the metric functions m, N^A and C_{AB} are independent of u (see Sec. 6.7 of Ref. [19]). In addition it is possible to make a further BMS transformation to a preferred, canonical Bondi frame, as we now review.

We first derive some properties of the Bondi mass aspect m and angular momentum aspect N_A under the above assumptions. From the evolution equation (2.8b) with $N_{AB} = \dot{N}_A = 0$ we obtain $4D_A m - \epsilon_{AB} D^B \chi = 0$ where $\chi = h^{BD}\epsilon^{AC} D_C D_B C_{AD}$. It follows that

$$m(\theta^A) = m_0, \tag{2.16}$$

a constant. Also from the $O(ur, 4)$ component of Einstein's equations with u derivatives dropped we obtain

$$6\mathcal{M} + D_A N^A + \frac{3}{16} C_{AB} C^{AB} = 0. \tag{2.17}$$

Taking next the subleading $O(uA, 3)$ component and using Eq. (2.17) to eliminate the subleading mass function $\mathcal{M}$ yields

$$D^2 N_A + N_A = -3D^B(m C_{AB}) + w_A, \tag{2.18}$$

where w_A is an expression quadratic in C_{AB} and its derivatives whose precise form will not be needed here. This equation will be useful below.

We now derive the transformation to the preferred canonical Bondi frame. The tensor C_{AB} can be decomposed into electric and magnetic parity pieces,

$$C_{AB} = (D_A D_B - \frac{1}{2} h_{AB} D^2)\Phi + \epsilon_{C(A} D_{B)} D^C \Psi, \tag{2.19}$$

where without loss of generality Φ and Ψ have no $l = 0, 1$ components. Taking the magnetic parity part of the time evolution equation (2.8b) for the angular momentum aspect by contracting it with $\epsilon^{AB} D_B$, using $N_{AB} = \dot{N}_A = 0$, and commuting indices using $R_{ABCD} = h_{AC}h_{BD} - h_{AD}h_{BC}$ gives $(D^2 + D^4/2)\Psi = 0$. This forces[5] the magnetic part Ψ to vanish. Next by using a BMS transformation with $Y^A = 0$ and $\alpha = \Phi/2$, we see from Eq. (2.14b) that we can also make the electric part Φ vanish, so that $C_{AB} = 0$.

Equation (2.18) for the angular momentum aspect now reduces to

$$D^2 N_A + N_A = 0. \tag{2.20}$$

We decompose N_A into electric parity and magnetic parity pieces, $N_A = D_A \Upsilon + \epsilon_{AB} D^B \Theta$. Substituting into Eq. (2.20) now shows that Υ and Θ satisfy $(D^2+2)\Upsilon = 0$ and $(D^2 + 2)\Theta = 0$, i.e., they are both $l = 1$ spherical harmonics. Thus the solutions of Eq. (2.20) for the angular momentum aspect coincide with the solutions discussed after Eq. (2.11) of the conformal Killing vector equation: three electric parity conformal Killing vectors, and three magnetic parity Killing vectors.

We now perform a BMS transformation with $\alpha = -\Upsilon/(3m_0)$, $Y^A = 0$. From the transformation law (2.14b) for C_{AB} we find that this transformation does not alter the gauge specialization $C_{AB} = 0$ that we have already achieved, since the differential operator $2D_A D_B - h_{AB} D^2$ on the right hand side annihilates $l = 1$ spherical harmonics. The effect of the transformation is to set the electric parity piece of N_A to zero, from Eq. (2.14c). Since the electric parity piece of N_A encodes information about the center of mass, this transformation corresponds roughly to translating to the center of mass frame. The remaining, magnetic parity piece of N_A encodes the intrinsic angular momentum.

To summarize, we have achieved a Bondi frame with

$$m(\theta^A) = m_0 = \text{constant}, \tag{2.21a}$$
$$C_{AB}(\theta^A) = 0, \tag{2.21b}$$
$$N_A(\theta^A) = \text{magnetic parity}, \, l = 1. \tag{2.21c}$$

D. Extended BMS algebra

The BMS algebra of approximate Killing vector fields $\vec{\xi}$ described above consists of vector fields that are smooth and finite on future null infinity $\mathcal{I}^+$. Relaxing this requirement, Banks [7] and Barnich and Troessaert [8–10] suggested instead that a larger algebra might be relevant. In particular[6], they suggested adding to the algebra more general solutions of the conformal Killing equation

[5] The inverse of the angular differential operator $D^2 + D^4/2$ on the space of functions with no $l = 0, 1$ pieces is given explicitly in Eq. (2.17) of Ref. [17] and also in Appendix C of Ref. [14].

[6] Barnich and Troessaert also consider singular vector fields which are generalizations of supertranslations. We will not focus on these extended supertranslations here, since the corresponding BMS charge integrals are ill-defined (divergent) in the Kerr spacetime [10]. However we do note that if we enlarge the algebra to include the superrotations (2.23), then we must also include extended supertranslations in order to obtain a closed Lie algebra, from Eqs. (4.17) of Ref. [15]. Thus, only a subset of the charges associated with this algebra are well defined and finite.

(2.11), in addition to the six smooth solutions discussed above. In complex stereographic coordinates $(z, \bar{z})$ with $z = \cot(\theta/2)e^{i\varphi}$, the conformal Killing equation reduces to

$$\partial_z Y^z = 0, \quad \partial_{\bar{z}} Y^{\bar{z}} = 0, \tag{2.22}$$

and one can consider solutions $Y^z = Y^z(z)$, $Y^{\bar{z}} = Y^{\bar{z}}(\bar{z})$, where Y^z and $Y^{\bar{z}}$ are meromorphic functions of their arguments. A basis[7] of this set of vector fields is

$$l_m = -z^{m+1}\partial_z, \tag{2.23a}$$
$$\bar{l}_m = -\bar{z}^{m+1}\partial_{\bar{z}}, \tag{2.23b}$$

for $m \in \mathbf{Z}$. Of this infinite basis the six vector fields $l_{-1}, l_0, l_1, \bar{l}_{-1}, \bar{l}_0, \bar{l}_1$ are those discussed after Eq. (2.11) above that occur in the usual BMS algebra. The remaining new vector fields are singular and cannot be used to define smooth finite diffeomorphisms of the 2-sphere to itself.

The new vector fields have been called "superrotations" in the literature [8–10, 13], since they are generalizations of the six generators of the Lorentz group. However they could more accurately be called "superboosts", since they are conformal Killing vectors but not Killing vectors on the 2-sphere, like normal boosts but unlike normal rotations.

What is the physical relevance or utility of the extended BMS algebra? There has been some debate in the literature on this issue. One approach to answering this question is to check whether there are constraints on the quantum gravity S-matrix associated with the additional symmetries. Kapec et. al. [13] showed that this is indeed the case at tree level. Another approach is to determine whether there are well-defined classical conserved quantities for the new symmetries, just as there are for the standard BMS symmetries. Barnich and Troessaert followed this approach in Ref. [10], where they computed charge integrals associated with the new generators (2.23) with $|m| > 1$ in the Kerr spacetime, and found that they vanish. In the next section, we will extend their analysis to more general situations to show that the charges are finite and to clarify their physical interpretation.

III. BMS CONSERVED CHARGES

A. Charges for standard BMS algebra

We first discuss the charges associated with the standard BMS group. Normally the charges associated with conservation laws can be derived from Noether's theorem. However this does not apply to charges associated with BMS generators at future null infinity, since the associated charges are not actually conserved due to fluxes of gravitational radiation. Wald and Zoupas have derived a generalization of Noether's theorem that allows one to define conserved charges and fluxes in very general situations of this kind [6]. One obtains for each generator $\vec{\xi}$ a 2-form Θ on $\mathcal{I}^+$, which depends linearly on $\vec{\xi}$, and whose integral over any cut (cross-section) $\mathcal{C}$ gives the charge

$$Q(\mathcal{C}, \vec{\xi}) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \Theta \tag{3.1}$$

associated with that cut. In addition, the exterior derivative $d\Theta$ of the 2-form can be interpreted as a flux that can be integrated over a region of $\mathcal{I}^+$ to give the change in the charge between two cuts. For general relativity, the flux formula had previously been obtained by Ashtekar and Streubel [4], and the charge associated with a cut had been obtained using a different method by Dray and Streubel [5].

In the retarded Bondi coordinates used here, an explicit formula for the charge Q can be obtained as follows. For simplicity we specialize to regions of $\mathcal{I}^+$ which are stationary, and we assume that the leading and subleading stress-energy components vanish. It follows that the metric functions m and C_{AB} are independent[8] of u. Then, for the generator $\vec{\xi}$ given in terms of $\alpha(\theta^A)$ and $Y^A(\theta^B)$ by Eq. (2.12), and for the cut $\mathcal{C}$ given by $u = u_0$, the charge is

$$Q = \frac{1}{16\pi}\int d^2\Omega \Big[4\alpha m - 2u_0 Y^A D_A m + 2Y^A N_A \\ -\frac{1}{8}Y^A D_A (C_{BC}C^{BC}) - \frac{1}{2}Y^A C_{AB} D_C C^{BC} \Big]. \tag{3.2}$$

Note that this charge is independent of u_0, i.e. independent of the cut $\mathcal{C}$, as we would expect due to stationarity[9].

The formula (3.2) can be obtained from the prescription given after Eq. (83) of Wald and Zoupas [6]. We decompose the generator $\vec{\xi}$ uniquely as the sum $\vec{\xi} = \vec{\xi}_1 + \vec{\xi}_2$ of two generators, where $\vec{\xi}_1$ is tangent to $\mathcal{C}$ and $\vec{\xi}_2$ is a supertranslation, and use the linear dependence of the charge on $\vec{\xi}$ to evaluate the charge as $Q = Q[\vec{\xi}_1] + Q[\vec{\xi}_2]$. Explicit expressions for the two generators are

$$\vec{\xi}_1 = \frac{1}{2}(u - u_0) D_A Y^A \partial_u + Y^A \partial_A \tag{3.3}$$

[7] Although only real vector fields $Y^A(\theta^B)$ are physical, for convenience we use a complex basis in what follows. A real basis can be obtained by taking linear combinations.

[8] The fact that the news tensor $N_{AB} = \dot{C}_{AB}$ vanishes in stationary regions is proved in Ref. [20]. The result for the Bondi mass aspect m then follows from Eq. (2.8a).

[9] This can be seen by differentiating both sides with respect to u_0, and using the evolution equation (2.8b) for the derivative of N_A. The integral of Y^A against the third and fourth terms on the right hand side of Eq. (2.8b) vanishes since it is proportional to $\int d^2\Omega \kappa (D^4 + D^6/2)\Psi$, where $Y^A = D^A\chi + \epsilon^{AB} D_B \kappa$ and Ψ is defined by Eq. (2.19). This vanishes since κ is purely $l = 1$ while Ψ is purely $l \geq 2$.

is and $\vec{\xi}_2 = (\alpha + \frac{1}{2}u_0 D_A Y^A)\partial_u$. The contribution to the charge from $\vec{\xi}_1$ is given by the integral of the Noether charge 2-form given by their Eq. (44), i.e. the Komar formula. In order to get a unique result from this prescription, Wald explains that from the equivalence class of vector fields on spacetime that corresponds to the desired BMS generator, one should choose a representative $\vec{\xi}$ that satisfies $\nabla_a \xi^a = 0$, as proved in Ref. [21]. In fact an examination of the argument in Ref. [21] shows that a sufficient condition for uniqueness is $\nabla_a \xi^a = O(1/r^2)$, which is satisfied by the representatives (2.12) used here. Using a vector field of the form (2.12) associated with the generator (3.3), the metric (2.1), and computing the integral (92) of Ref. [6] over the surface $u = u_0$, $r = r_0$ and taking $r_0 \to \infty$ yields the third, fourth and fifth terms in Eq. (3.2) above. The remaining, first and second terms are obtained by inserting the generator $\vec{\xi}_2$ into the integral (98) of Ref. [6]. The formula (3.2) was derived by a different method[10] by Barnich and Troessaert in Ref. [10].

We next introduce some notations to describe the different charges. The quantity (3.2) is a linear function of α and Y^A, and we choose a basis of this vector space as follows. We parameterize the function α as

$$\alpha = t^0 - t^i n_i + \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} \alpha_{lm} Y_{lm}, \tag{3.4}$$

where $n_i = (\sin\theta\cos\varphi, \sin\theta\sin\varphi, \cos\theta)$ and $t^\mu = (t^0, t^i)$ are real parameters. Similarly we write Y^A as a linear combination of conformal Killing vectors as

$$Y^A = \omega^{0i} e^A_{\ i} + \omega^{ij} e^A_{\ [i} n_{j]}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $e^A_{\ i} = D^A n_i$; in Minkowski spacetime this corresponds via Eq. (2.12) to the limiting form of the Killing vector $\omega^{\alpha\beta} x_{[\beta}\partial_{\alpha]}$. We now define the quantities P^μ, $J^{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{lm}$ by

$$Q = -P^\mu t_\mu + \frac{1}{2} J^{\mu\nu}\omega_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{4\pi}\sum_{l=2}^{\infty}\sum_{m=-l}^{l} \mathcal{P}^*_{lm}\alpha_{lm}. \tag{3.6}$$

Here the four-momentum P^μ and angular momentum $J^{\mu\nu}$ transform in the normal way under the Lorentz transformation subgroup of the BMS group given by taking $\alpha = 0$ in Eq. (2.9). The quantities $\mathcal{P}_{lm}$ are usually called "supermomentum" [4, 23], although they have also been considered to be generalizations of angular momentum [24]. We will use the terminology supermomentum since they are conjugate to supertranslations, they have the same physical dimension as momentum, and they are invariant under translations and supertranslations (see Appendix A), like normal momentum.

By comparing Eqs. (3.2) and (3.6) we see that the Bondi mass P^0 is given by the $l = 0$ component of the Bondi mass aspect $m(\theta^A)$, the linear momentum P^i is given by the $l = 1$ component, and the supermomentum by the higher l components. Similarly when $C_{AB} = 0$ the angular momentum is given by the $l = 1$ component of the angular momentum aspect $N_A(\theta^B)$, with the intrinsic angular momentum being encoded in the magnetic parity piece, and the center-of-mass information being encoded in the electric parity piece, as discussed in Sec. II C above.

The definitions (3.6) are of course dependent on the choice of Bondi frame: the four-momentum P^μ, angular momentum $J^{\mu\nu}$ and supermomentum $\mathcal{P}_{lm}$ transform into one another under BMS transformations, just as energy and 3-momentum transform into one another under Lorentz transformations. See Appendix A for details.

B. Charges for extended BMS algebra

We now consider the additional symmetries of the extended BMS algebra discussed in Sec. II D above. We will call the charges associated with the superrotations (2.23) "super center-of-mass" charges since the superrotations are generalizations of boost symmetries, and boost symmetries are conjugate to the center-of-mass piece of angular momentum. Further justification for this terminology will be derived below.

Should one expect the existence of conserved quantities for singular symmetry generators $\vec{\xi}$ like superrotations? The generalization of Noether's theorem derived in Ref. [6] remains formally valid, but it is possible that some of the steps in the argument are invalidated when the vector field $\vec{\xi}$ is not smooth. Ideally one would like to generalize the derivation given there to the present context. A simpler alternative, as a first step, is to simply evaluate the final expression (3.2) for the conserved charges for the superrotations and see if one obtains a finite result. This is the approach we will follow here, following Barnich and Troessaert [10]. Clearly a more fundamental investigation of the applicability of the generalized Noether's theorem to singular symmetry vector fields is warranted. It would also be useful to investigate the fluxes as well as the charges.

As before, we specialize to approximately stationary, vacuum regions near $\mathcal{I}^+$. We would like to explicitly evaluate the BMS charge integral (3.2) for $\alpha = 0$ and for Y^A taken to be the superrotation generator l_m given by Eq. (2.23a) with $|m| > 1$.

We first explain why the integral is finite, despite the

[10] The method used by Barnich and Troessaert is based on a formula for a variation of the charge which is not integrable. This non-integrability issue is resolved in Ref. [6]; however, it does not affect the stationary case considered here. Formulae similar to Eq. (3.2) were derived in Ref. [19] [their Eq. (6.14)] and Ref. [22], but those authors found the results $\alpha_1 = 0$, $\alpha_2 = -1/2$ and $\alpha_1 = -1/8$, $\alpha_2 = -2$, respectively, where α_1 and α_2 are the coefficients of the last two terms in Eq. (3.2), whose values here are $\alpha_1 = -1/8$, $\alpha_2 = -1/2$. We were unable to uncover the source of the discrepancies.

fact that Y^A can be singular. The integrand in Eq. (3.2) is a product of a meromorphic function of z times a smooth function, and it is a well known property of meromorphic functions that such integrals are locally finite. This result can be understood by expanding the smooth function as a sum of terms of the form $z^p\bar{z}^q$ with p, q non-negative. Integrating against a singularity z^{-m} with $m > 0$ yields

$$\int dz d\bar{z} z^{-m}\, z^p \bar{z}^q = \int d\theta \int d\rho \rho^{1-m+p+q} e^{i\theta(-m+p-q)},$$

where $z = \rho e^{i\theta}$. The angular integral vanishes unless $m = p-q$, and then the remaining factor in the integrand is proportional to ρ^{1+2q} which is nonsingular.

We now turn to deriving an explicit expression for the charge $Q[l_m]$ associated with the superrotation l_m. In stationary regions, there is a preferred Bondi frame in which the metric functions satisfy the three conditions (2.21). In order to simplify the computation, we will restrict attention to Bondi frames[11] which are close to this frame, so that we can linearize in the deviation. In particular we can neglect the terms quadratic in C_{AB} in Eq. (3.2), yielding

$$Q = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^2\Omega Y^A N_A. \tag{3.7}$$

Also Eq. (2.18) reduces to

$$D^2 N_A + N_A = -3m_0 D^B C_{AB}, \tag{3.8}$$

where m_0 is the angular average of $m(\theta^A)$. Using the decomposition (2.19) of C_{AB} into electric and magnetic parity pieces and setting the magnetic parity piece to zero as justified after Eq. (2.19) now gives the solution

$$N_A = -3m_0 D_A \Phi/2 + N_A^{l=1}, \tag{3.9}$$

where $N_A^{l=1}$ is a $l = 1$, homogeneous solution of Eq. (3.8) of the type discussed in Sec. II C above. Next we expand Φ as

$$\Phi = \sum_{l\geq 2} \Phi_{lm} Y_{lm}, \tag{3.10}$$

and combine Eqs. (2.23a), (3.7) and (3.9) to yield

$$Q[l_m] = m_0 \sum_{l\geq|m|} \kappa_{lm} \Phi_{l,-m}, \quad \text{if} \quad |m| > 1, \tag{3.11}$$

where the constants κ_{lm} are given by

$$\kappa_{lm} = -\frac{3}{8} \int_0^\pi d\theta \sin\theta (m - \cos\theta) \cot^m(\theta/2) Y_{l,-m}(\theta, 0). \tag{3.12}$$

This integral evaluates to $\hat{\kappa}_{lm}$ for $m \geq 2$, and to $(-1)^{l+1}\hat{\kappa}_{l(-m)}$ for $m \leq -2$, where

$$\hat{\kappa}_{lm} = -\frac{3}{8}\sqrt{\frac{(2l+1)(l+m)!}{\pi(l-m)!}} \frac{1}{(l^2+l-2)\Gamma(m-1)} \tag{3.13}$$

These constants are finite even for $m < 0$. The charge $Q[\bar{l}_m]$ is given by a similar expression but with $\Phi_{l,-m}$ replaced by Φ_{lm} in Eq. (3.11) and with $Y_{l,-m}$ replaced by Y_{lm} in Eq. (3.12).

Thus, the super center-of-mass charges $Q[l_m]$ and $Q[\bar{l}_m]$ give information about the tensor C_{AB}, via Eqs. (2.19), (3.10) and (3.11), although the information is incomplete as one cannot reconstruct C_{AB} from these charges.

IV. PHYSICAL INTERPRETATION OF BMS AND EXTENDED BMS CHARGES

In this final section we make some remarks about the physical significance of BMS charges and in particular how they can be measured.

A. General considerations

For all symmetry generators $\vec{\xi}$ and cuts $\mathcal{C}$ of future null infinity $\mathcal{I}^+$, the charges $Q[\vec{\xi}, \mathcal{C}]$ are defined in terms of integrals over $\mathcal{C}$, which can be evaluated in terms a limit of integrals over finite 2-surfaces which tend to $\mathcal{C}$. It follows that the charges can in principle be measured by a collections of observers distributed over a 2-surface near future null infinity, who each make local measurements of the spacetime geometry in their vicinity and of their motion and orientation relative to their neighbors, and who then communicate this information to one another and process it in a suitable way. Thus, in principle the charges are measurable quantities. Of course, it would be useful to understand in more detail how to specify a local[12] operational prescription[13] for such measurements. The formalism of rigid quasilocal frames of Refs. [26–29] might be useful for this purpose, as well as the covariant conformal completion formalism for asymptotically flat spacetimes [18].

Specifying an asymptotic Bondi frame allows observers to establish a convention for labeling the various charges. By asymptotic Bondi frame we mean a choice of coordinates (u, θ^A) on $\mathcal{I}^+$ for which the spacetime metric takes the form (2.1), which is unique up to BMS transformations. A Bondi frame is determined up to an overall

[11] It might seem that the quantity we are computing is a pure gauge effect, since it vanishes in the preferred Bondi gauge. This is true locally in time, but as discussed in Sec. IV B below the change in the charge between two successive stationary regions encodes physical, non-gauge information.

[12] By this we mean to exclude, for example, demanding that observers be stationary with respect to retarded Bondi coordinates, which would be a nonlocal requirement.

[13] Such a prescription can be given for the Poincaré charges in stationary situations [25].

$SO(3)$ rotation by specifying a single cross section or cut of $\mathcal{I}^+$. One can equivalently think of a Bondi frame as an equivalence class of coordinate systems on spacetime whose asymptotic limits coincide in a suitable way, or as a class of asymptotic observers who adjust their relative motions, clocks and orientations in such a way as to establish an approximate consistent convention for specifying the results of asymptotic measurements[14].

B. Relation to gravitational wave memory

Gravitational wave memory is the relative displacement of initially comoving observers caused by the passage of a burst of gravitational waves [30–32]. There is a well-known close relation between gravitational wave memory for observers near future null infinity and the BMS group: the supertranslation that relates the canonical Bondi frame of an initially stationary region to that of a final stationary region encodes the observed memory effect [21, 24, 33]. See Strominger et. al. [16] for a recent clear exposition of this relation in the retarded Bondi coordinates used here. The memory/supertranslation effect can also be characterized in a gauge invariant but nonlocal way in terms of a generalized holonomy around a suitable closed loop in spacetime near $\mathcal{I}^+$ [25].

Here we point out a new aspect of this story: a close correspondence between the two different infinite families of extended BMS charges (supermomentum and super center-of-mass) and the two different types of memory (ordinary and null [14]).

Consider a spacetime in which the flux of energy to future null infinity vanishes at some early retarded time u_1, so that the news tensor N_{AB} and stress energy tensor vanish there. Suppose that there is subsequently a burst of gravitational waves and/or matter energy flux to infinity, and that the fluxes vanish again at some later retarded time u_2. Freely falling, initially comoving adjacent observers near infinity can measure their net relative displacement, and as shown in Ref. [16], to leading order in $1/r$ this displacement is encoded in the change

$$\Delta C_{AB} = C_{AB}(u_2) - C_{AB}(u_1), \tag{4.1}$$

of the tensor C_{AB}. Thus we will identify the change (4.1) as the gravitational wave memory observable[15].

The observable change (4.1) can be decomposed into electric parity and magnetic parity pieces, as discussed in Sec. II C above. These two pieces can in principle be measured by surrounding a source of gravitational waves with a collection of observers distributed on a 2-sphere, have them each measure the gravitational wave memory, and then decompose the resulting function on the 2-sphere into electric and magnetic pieces. This would be analogous to measurements of E and B modes of the cosmic microwave background polarization. Here we will focus just on the electric parity piece, since the magnetic parity piece of C_{AB} vanishes in stationary regions, as shown in Sec. II C.

We next review the terminology of Bieri and Garfinkle [14] for the two different types of memory. Following Ref. [16], we substitute the decomposition (2.19) into the evolution equation (2.8a) for the Bondi mass aspect, and integrate from u_1 to u_2. The result is

$$\Delta m = -4\pi \Delta \mathcal{E} + \mathcal{D}\Delta\Phi. \tag{4.2}$$

Here $\Delta m = m(u_2) - m(u_1)$ is the change in the Bondi mass aspect, $\Delta\Phi = \Phi(u_2) - \Phi(u_1)$ is the potential for the electric piece of ΔC_{AB}, $\mathcal{D}$ is the angular differential operator $\mathcal{D} = D^2/4 + D^4/8$, and

$$\Delta \mathcal{E} = \int_{u_1}^{u_2} du \left[\hat{T}_{uu} + \frac{1}{32\pi} N_{AB} N^{AB} \right] \tag{4.3}$$

is the total energy radiated per unit solid angle in either matter or gravitational waves. Next we act on both sides of Eq. (4.2) with the projection operator $\mathcal{P}$ that sets to zero the $l = 0, 1$ pieces of functions on the sphere, and by the inverse[16] of the operator $\mathcal{D}$. Using $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}$ the result is [16]

$$\Delta\Phi = \mathcal{D}^{-1}\mathcal{P}\Delta m + 4\pi \mathcal{D}^{-1}\mathcal{P}\Delta\mathcal{E}. \tag{4.4}$$

The left hand side of this equation is the observable, the (electric parity piece of) the gravitational wave memory. The second term on the right hand side is what Bieri and Garfinkle called the *null memory*, the piece of the memory that is computable directly in terms of fluxes of energy[17] to future null infinity. The first term is what Bieri and Garfinkle called *ordinary memory*, of the kind originally discussed by Zel'dovich [30], which is computable from the change in asymptotic components of the Weyl curvature tensor between early and late times.

Comparing Eqs. (4.4) and (3.11), we see that the super center-of-mass charges $Q[l_m]$ contain information about the total, ordinary plus null, memory. The ordinary memory, on the other hand, is reflected in the $l \geq 2$ components of the Bondi mass aspect $m(\theta^A)$, which are encoded in the supermomenta $\mathcal{P}_{lm}$, from Eq. (3.6).

[14] There is a close analogy to local Lorentz frames, which can be thought of as a specification of a set of orthonormal basis vectors at a point in spacetime, an equivalence class of local coordinate systems, or a class of observers who adjust their motions, clocks and orientations in order to establish an approximate convention for specifying the results of measurements of components of tensors near that point.

[15] From Eq. (2.14b) the change ΔC_{AB} is invariant under supertranslations and transforms just under the Lorentz group.

[16] See footnote 5 above.

[17] Bieri and Garfinkle worked in the context of linearized gravity, and so did not have the gravitational wave energy flux term in Eq. (4.3). This term was originally computed in vacuum by Christodoulou [34] who called the effect "nonlinear memory". The formula with both matter and gravitational wave fluxes was derived in [16].

C. BMS charges as black hole hair

The BMS charges we have been discussing are universal, applying to any kind of isolated object in an asymptotically flat spacetime. In particular they apply to black holes. In this context they can be thought of as a kind of black hole hair, as pointed out by Strominger and Zhiboedov (SZ) [16]. SZ discussed how this hair could be measured in terms of a gravitational wave memory observation. Here we expand on that description to clarify how the no hair theorems [35] are evaded.

The supermomentum charges $\mathcal{P}_{lm}$ characterize departures from stationarity, from Eqs. (2.21a), (3.2) and (3.6) above, and so vanish[18] for black holes once they settle down to a stationary state. Thus black holes do not admit supermomentum hair.

The super center-of-mass charges, i.e. the tensor C_{AB}, are closely analogous to the angles (θ, φ) that specify the direction of the black hole's intrinsic angular momentum $\mathbf{S}$. Do those angles constitute black hole hair? Clearly, they do not give information about intrinsic properties of the black hole, since they merely reflect orientation with respect to an arbitrarily chosen asymptotic reference frame. On the other hand, if one considers observations at more than one time, and if the black hole accretes some angular momentum, then angle $\Delta\Theta$ by which the orientation changes between early and late times is a physical property of the black hole, independent of any choice of reference frame. In addition, even if one restricts attention to one instant of time, in quantum mechanics one can have superpositions of different angular momentum eigenstates, and the existence of a nontrivial superposition is again a physical property of the black hole, independent of any choice of reference frame.

The super center-of-mass hair is exactly analogous. In the classical theory, at one instant of time, they do not give any information about intrinsic properties of the black hole. Instead they give information about properties of the black hole relative to an arbitrarily chosen asymptotic Bondi frame, and those properties can be made to vanish with a suitable choice of Bondi frame in stationary situations [cf. Eq. (2.21b) above]. Hence the no hair theorems are not violated. On the other hand, if one considers measurements made at two different times at which the black hole is stationary, then the changes (4.1) in the charges give non trivial physical information, independent of any choice of reference frame. This information is the gravitational wave memory/supertranslation/generalized holonomy, as explained by SZ. Finally, if one restricts attention to one instant of time, one can have nontrivial superpositions of super center-of-mass eigenstates, and the existence of a nontrivial superposition is a physical property of the black hole, independent of any choice of reference frame. To produce such superpositions one can throw into a black hole matter that is in a superposition of two states, one state for which the gravitational wave emission associated with the accretion produces a net gravitational wave memory, and one state for which the net memory is zero. Thus in quantum gravity, the set of quantum states associated with low energy, asymptotic degrees of freedom of the black hole is richer than what would be expected from the classical theory, locally in time.

[18] More precisely, in a stationary region of $\mathcal{I}^+$ the supermomentum components $\mathcal{P}_{lm}$ need not vanish, depending on the choice of Bondi frame. However they are determined by the Bondi 4-momentum, so they contain no additional information.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have investigated the suggestion of Refs. [7–10] that the BMS symmetry algebra be extended. While we have found that some of the symmetry generators of the extended algebra have conserved charges that are finite and are associated with gravitational wave memory, there are several outstanding puzzles and open issues:

- Some of the elements of the extended BMS algebra are associated with divergent charge integrals (see footnote 6 above). At the very least this indicates that there is more to be understood.
- We have computed only charges and not associated fluxes, it would be useful to verify that the corresponding flux expressions have the expected properties.
- We computed the charges only in a certain regime where some nonlinearities could be neglected, cf. the discussion before Eq. (3.7) above, and only in stationary vacuum regions of $\mathcal{I}^+$. It might be interesting to investigate the properties of the charges more generally.
- The new charges capture some but not all of the information associated with the observable gravitational wave memory, cf. the discussion after Eq. (3.12) above. This suggests that yet larger symmetry algebras might be relevant.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank David Garfinkle and Abhay Ashtekar for helpful conversations, and Leo Stein for helpful discussions and for evaluating the integral (3.12). We thank Andy Strominger and Sabrina Pasterski for helpful correspondence. This research was supported in part by NSF grants PHY-1404105 and PHY–1068541.

Appendix A: Transformation properties of charges under finite BMS transformations

The transformation properties of the charges under finite BMS transformations can be derived from the definitions (2.9), (2.10) and (3.1); see for example Appendices C.5 and C.6 of Chrusciel *et. al.* [19]. Here we restrict attention to stationary regions of $\mathcal{I}^+$ so that we can neglect the cut dependence of the charges. Consider a finite BMS transformation $\psi : \mathcal{I}^+ \to \mathcal{I}^+$ of the form (2.9). It can be parameterized in terms of a map $\varphi : S^2 \to S^2$ of the 2-sphere to itself, and a function β on the 2-sphere [denoted by α in Eq. (2.9)]. The BMS generator $\vec{\xi} = (\alpha, Y^A)$ given by Eq. (2.10) is mapped by the pullback to $\psi_* \vec{\xi} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{Y}^A)$, where $\hat{Y}^A = \varphi_* Y^A$ and

$$\hat{\alpha} = \omega_\varphi \, \varphi_* \alpha + \frac{1}{2} \beta D_A \hat{Y}^A - \hat{Y}^A D_A \beta, \tag{A1}$$

where ω_φ is defined by $\varphi_* h_{AB} = \omega_\varphi^{-2} h_{AB}$. For rotations $\omega_\varphi = 1$, while for a boost with rapidity parameter η in the direction $\mathbf{m}$, $\omega_\varphi(\mathbf{n}) = \cosh\eta + \sinh\eta \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{m}$. The charges transform according to[19]

$$Q[\vec{\xi}] \to \bar{Q}[\vec{\xi}] = Q[\psi_*^{-1} \vec{\xi}]. \tag{A2}$$

For boosts and rotations the results are as follows. The 4-momentum and angular momentum transform in the standard way:

$$\bar{P}^\alpha = \Lambda^\alpha{}_\beta P^\beta, \qquad \bar{J}^{\alpha\beta} = \Lambda^\alpha{}_\mu \Lambda^\beta{}_\nu J^{\mu\nu}. \tag{A3}$$

Here $\Lambda^\alpha{}_\beta$ is the Lorentz transformation that is naturally associated with φ, obtained by demanding that the action of the Lorentz transformation on the set of null directions $(1, \mathbf{n})$ coincide with that of φ^{-1} [20]. For the supermomentum, it is more convenient to give the transformation law in terms of the Bondi mass aspect, which encodes the supermomenta according to [cf. Eqs. (3.2), (3.4) and (3.6)]

$$m(\theta^A) = P^0 + 3 P_i n^i + \sum_{l \geq 2} \sum_m \mathcal{P}_{lm} Y_{lm}. \tag{A4}$$

The transformation law is

$$\bar{m}(\theta^A) = m[\varphi(\theta^A)] \omega_\varphi(\theta^A)^{-3}. \tag{A5}$$

Finally the tensor C_{AB} which encodes the super center-of-mass charges transforms as

$$\bar{C}_{AB} = \omega_\varphi \, \varphi_* C_{AB}. \tag{A6}$$

Consider next translations and supertranslations, which are parameterized by the function β. The 4-momentum and supermomentum are invariant under these transformations. The angular momentum transforms as $\bar{J}_{\mu\nu} = J_{\mu\nu} + \delta J_{\mu\nu}$ with

$$\delta J_{ij} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^2\Omega \, m \, e^A_{[i} n_{j]} D_A \beta, \tag{A7a}$$

$$\delta J_{0i} = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int d^2\Omega \, \beta (D^A n_i D_A m - 3 n_i m). \tag{A7b}$$

By using Eq. (A4) these angular momentum changes can be expressed in terms of the 4-momentum and supermomentum. For a normal translation with $\beta = t^0 - t^i n_i$ we recover the standard transformation law $\delta J_{\mu\nu} = -t_\mu P_\nu + t_\nu P_\mu$. Finally the tensor C_{AB} transforms according to the same transformation law as in the linearized case:

$$\bar{C}_{AB} = C_{AB} - 2 D_A D_A \beta + h_{AB} D^2 \beta. \tag{A8}$$

[1] H. Bondi, M. G. J. van der Burg, and A. W. K. Metzner, "Gravitational Waves in General Relativity. VII. Waves from Axi-Symmetric Isolated Systems," *Royal Society of London Proceedings Series A* **269** (Aug., 1962) 21–52.

[2] R. K. Sachs, "Gravitational Waves in General Relativity. VIII. Waves in Asymptotically Flat Space-Time," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series A* **270** (Oct., 1962) 103–126.

[3] R. Sachs, "Asymptotic Symmetries in Gravitational Theory," *Physical Review* **128** (Dec., 1962) 2851–2864.

[4] A. Ashtekar and M. Streubel, "Symplectic Geometry of Radiative Modes and Conserved Quantities at Null Infinity," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series A* **376** (May, 1981) 585–607.

[5] T. Dray and M. Streubel, "Angular momentum at null infinity," *Class. Quantum Gravity* **1** (Jan., 1984) 15–26.

[6] R. M. Wald and A. Zoupas, "A General definition of 'conserved quantities' in general relativity and other theories of gravity," *Phys. Rev.* **D61** (2000) 084027, arXiv:gr-qc/9911095 [gr-qc].

[7] T. Banks, "A Critique of pure string theory: Heterodox opinions of diverse dimensions," arXiv:hep-th/0306074 [hep-th]. (see footnote 17).

[8] G. Barnich and C. Troessaert, "Symmetries of asymptotically flat 4 dimensional spacetimes at null infinity revisited," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 111103, arXiv:0909.2617 [gr-qc].

[9] G. Barnich and C. Troessaert, "Supertranslations call

[19] We use ψ^{-1} instead of ψ in this transformation law in order to agree with convention of the linearized analysis of Sec. II B above. The charges are invariant under $\vec{\xi} \to \psi_* \vec{\xi}$, $g_{ab} \to \psi_* g_{ab}$, so the convention $g_{ab} \to \psi_* g_{ab}$ used there is equivalent to the convention $\vec{\xi} \to \psi_*^{-1} \vec{\xi}$ used here.

[20] Formally the Lorentz transformation $\Lambda^\alpha{}_\beta$ as well as P^α and $J^{\alpha\beta}$ are tensors over the 4-parameter translation subgroup of the BMS group, which has a flat $(-,+,+,+)$ metric [20].

for superrotations," *PoS* (2010) 010, arXiv:1102.4632 [gr-qc]. [Ann. U. Craiova Phys.21,S11(2011)].

[10] G. Barnich and C. Troessaert, "BMS charge algebra," *Journal of High Energy Physics* **12** (Dec., 2011) 105, arXiv:1106.0213 [hep-th].

[11] A. Strominger, "On BMS Invariance of Gravitational Scattering," *JHEP* **07** (2014) 152, arXiv:1312.2229 [hep-th].

[12] T. He, V. Lysov, P. Mitra, and A. Strominger, "BMS supertranslations and Weinberg's soft graviton theorem," *JHEP* **05** (2015) 151, arXiv:1401.7026 [hep-th].

[13] D. Kapec, V. Lysov, S. Pasterski, and A. Strominger, "Semiclassical Virasoro symmetry of the quantum gravity $\mathcal{S}$-matrix," *JHEP* **08** (2014) 058, arXiv:1406.3312 [hep-th].

[14] L. Bieri and D. Garfinkle, "Perturbative and gauge invariant treatment of gravitational wave memory," *Phys. Rev.* **D89** no. 8, (2014) 084039, arXiv:1312.6871 [gr-qc].

[15] G. Barnich and C. Troessaert, "Aspects of the BMS/CFT correspondence," *JHEP* **05** (2010) 062, arXiv:1001.1541 [hep-th].

[16] A. Strominger and A. Zhiboedov, "Gravitational Memory, BMS Supertranslations and Soft Theorems," arXiv:1411.5745 [hep-th].

[17] S. Pasterski, A. Strominger, and A. Zhiboedov, "New Gravitational Memories," arXiv:1502.06120 [hep-th].

[18] R. M. Wald, *General relativity*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 1984.

[19] P. T. Chrusciel, J. Jezierski, and J. Kijowski, *Hamiltonian field theory in the radiating regime*. Springer Lecture notes in physics, New York, 2002.

[20] R. Geroch, "Asymptotic Structure of Space-Time," in *Asymptotic Structure of Space-Time*, F. Esposito and L. Witten, eds. Plenum Press, New York, 1977.

[21] R. Geroch and J. Winicour, "Linkages in general relativity," *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **22** (Apr., 1981) 803–812.

[22] I. Fujisawa and R. Nakayama, "Bondi-Metzner-Sachs surface-charge algebra via a Hamiltonian framework," *Phys. Rev.* **D91** no. 12, (2015) 126005, arXiv:1503.03225 [hep-th].

[23] G. Barnich and B. Oblak, "Notes on the BMS group in three dimensions: II. Coadjoint representation," *Journal of High Energy Physics* **3** (Mar., 2015) 33, arXiv:1502.00010 [hep-th].

[24] A. D. Helfer, "Angular momentum of isolated systems," *General Relativity and Gravitation* **39** (Dec., 2007) 2125–2147, arXiv:0709.1078 [gr-qc].

[25] E. E. Flanagan and D. A. Nichols, "Observer dependence of angular momentum in general relativity and its relationship to the gravitational-wave memory effect," arXiv:1411.4599 [gr-qc].

[26] R. J. Epp, R. B. Mann, and P. L. McGrath, "Rigid motion revisited: rigid quasilocal frames," *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **26** no. 3, (Feb., 2009) 035015, arXiv:0810.0072 [gr-qc].

[27] R. J. Epp, R. B. Mann, and P. L. McGrath, "On the Existence and Utility of Rigid Quasilocal Frames," *ArXiv e-prints* (July, 2013) , arXiv:1307.1914 [gr-qc].

[28] R. J. Epp, P. L. McGrath, and R. B. Mann, "Momentum in general relativity: local versus quasilocal conservation laws," *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **30** no. 19, (Oct., 2013) 195019, arXiv:1306.5500 [gr-qc].

[29] P. L. McGrath, "Rigid Quasilocal Frames," *ArXiv e-prints* (Feb., 2014) , arXiv:1402.1443 [gr-qc].

[30] Y. B. Zel'dovich and A. G. Polnarev, "Radiation of gravitational waves by a cluster of superdense stars," *Sov.x Astron.* **18** (Aug., 1974) 17.

[31] V. B. Braginskii and K. S. Thorne, "Gravitational-wave bursts with memory and experimental prospects," *Nature (London)* **327** (May, 1987) 123–125.

[32] V. Braginskii and L. Grishchuk, "Kinematic resonance and memory effect in free-mass gravitational antennas," *JETP* **62** no. 3, (1985) 427.

[33] E. T. Newman and R. Penrose, "Note on the Bondi-Metzner-Sachs Group," *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **7** (May, 1966) 863–870.

[34] D. Christodoulou, "Nonlinear nature of gravitation and gravitational-wave experiments," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67** (Sep, 1991) 1486–1489. http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.67.1486.

[35] M. Heusler, *Black hole uniqueness theorems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1996.